

[REDACTED]

Sent: 22 July 2026 14:52
To: Planning
Subject: Attn Hannah Darley re DC/26/1064 Woodhouse Farm

Categories: Comments Received

Dear Ms Darley - I understand that you are the planning officer for this application for which I have received no written letter to our house at Old Woodhouse, bn5 9BA and would urgently request your consideration of my total rejection of this application as outlined below.

To: Planning Services, Horsham District Council

Application: DC/26/1064 – Woodhouse Farm, Wheatsheaf Road, Albourne

Proposal: Conversion of an agricultural building to four dwellings

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wholeheartedly object to application DC/26/1064 for the reasons set out below.

The application should firstly be treated as invalid because the submitted site location plan identifies the wrong site. If the Council decides to determine the application regardless, prior approval should be refused because the proposal does not meet the requirements of Class Q and would result in unacceptable cumulative highway and residential impacts.

The submitted location plan does not correspond with the barn or the development shown on the proposed block plan. The red line appears to identify a different part of Woodhouse Farm rather than the building proposed for conversion. As a result, the application does not correctly identify the development site, the proposed residential curtilage, the parking and turning areas, or the land over which access would be taken. The Council, consultees and neighbouring occupiers cannot properly assess an application where the statutory site plan identifies the wrong land.

There is also no suitable existing access capable of serving the proposed development. The access is a narrow, mainly single-track rural route with no formal passing places. The east-west section to the north of the site consists of two concrete wheel tracks with grass between them and was constructed to serve two houses and occasional farm traffic. It was not designed for the volume or type of traffic that would arise from the level of residential development now proposed.

The four proposed dwellings would share the access with the six dwellings approved under DC/25/0825, two existing houses and continuing farm traffic. The approved scheme provides six dwellings and fourteen parking spaces, while the current proposal adds a further four dwellings and eight parking spaces. This would result in ten Class Q dwellings and twenty-two parking spaces, in addition to the existing houses and agricultural use. Class Q requires suitable existing access to a public highway. A narrow single-track access with no passing places, shared by ten new dwellings, existing houses and farm vehicles, cannot reasonably be regarded as suitable for this intensity of use.

Traffic from the current proposal would also pass directly in front of the six dwellings approved under DC/25/0825, between the houses and their parking spaces. The approved plan shows the access road immediately alongside the residential frontage, with the parking spaces on the opposite side. Residents, visitors and children would therefore need to cross the vehicle route when walking between the dwellings and parked cars and there is no separate footway or delineated pedestrian route

This arrangement would create regular conflicts between pedestrians, cars, delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles and agricultural machinery. Vehicles meeting on the single-track sections would have to reverse, potentially over considerable distances and through areas used by residents and pedestrians. The grass-centred concrete track,

together with the remainder of the route to the public highway, is not constructed to accommodate this cumulative level of residential traffic. The likely consequences include unsafe reversing, obstruction, damage to the track edges, mud, standing water and general deterioration of the access.

The proposed block plan identifies Barn 1 to the north but does not show the six approved dwellings, their fourteen parking spaces or the access route passing between them. It therefore fails to show the true relationship between the two schemes and presents the current proposal as though it were separate from the adjoining approved development.

The location and siting of the building also make the proposed residential use impractical and undesirable as the proposed access would serve a total ten new dwellings, twenty-two parking spaces, two existing houses and an active farm, with traffic passing directly in front of neighbouring homes and through their parking and pedestrian areas. This would create a poor and unsafe residential environment for the occupants of the adjacent development of six new dwellings. The additional traffic would also pass close to the fronts and gardens of the approved dwellings, resulting in engine noise, headlights, vehicle doors, manoeuvring and reversing throughout the day and evening.

There are further concerns as to whether the proposal falls within the scope of Class Q. The scheme includes four private gardens, eight parking spaces, landscaping and a substantial fire appliance access and turning area. These works appear to go beyond the limited curtilage and building operations permitted under Class Q. The proposal is more than the straightforward conversion of an agricultural building and amounts to a wider residential redevelopment of the farmyard.

The application is also not supported by a structural assessment confirming the extent of the works required. Without clear evidence that the existing structure can accommodate four dwellings without extensive reconstruction, the Council cannot conclude that the proposal falls within the scope of works permitted by Class Q.

The Council must also consider the Class Q history of the whole established agricultural unit. The six dwellings approved under DC/25/0825, together with the four now proposed, would bring the total to ten. The total number and floor area of all Class Q dwellings already developed or approved across the agricultural unit should therefore be checked, together with any agricultural buildings erected under permitted development rights. Any breach of the numerical, floorspace or agricultural-history limitations would mean that the Class Q right does not apply.

For these reasons, I request that the Council treat the application as invalid because the submitted location plan identifies the wrong site. If the application is determined, prior approval should be refused because: the building does not have suitable existing access to a public highway; the cumulative transport and highway impacts would be unsafe; the route would create unacceptable conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and farm traffic; the proposed curtilage, parking, turning and landscaping works exceed the limited scope of Class Q; and it has not been demonstrated that the works amount to conversion rather than substantial rebuilding.

Yours faithfully, [REDACTED], old Woodhouse farmhouse bn5 9BA